

**Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation**

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION**PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION**

Requestor's Name and Address: PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL OF PLANO 3255 W PIONEER PKWY ARLINGTON TX 76013	MFDR Tracking #: M4-06-6548-01
	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
	Date of Injury:
Respondent Name and Box #: INDEMNITY INSURANCE CO OF NORTH AMERICA Rep Box # 15	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Requestor's Position Summary: "Understanding that TWCC is wanting to move to a hospital reimbursement of a % -over-Medicare, we have used that methodology in our calculation of fair and reasonable. Medicare would have reimbursed the provider at the rate of 125% over the Medicare Fee Schedule for CPT's 93307, 93320, 93325, 93005, 93012 and 71260. Also for the ER charge they would have reimbursed 75% of the billed charges, leaving a balance owed of \$1,955.44."

Principal Documentation:

1. DWC 60 Package
2. Total Amount Sought - \$1955.44
3. Hospital Bill
4. EOBs

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY AND PRINCIPAL DOCUMENTATION

Respondent's Position Summary: The respondent did not submit a response to the request for medical fee dispute resolution.

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
06/18/2005	L001, W1, L002, W4, (855-002), (920-002)	Emergency Room Visit with Radiological Services	\$1,955.44	\$0.00
Total /Due:				\$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

1. For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason codes:

- L001, W1-Workers compensation state fee schedule adjustment.
- L002, W4-No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.
- (855-002)-Recommended allowance is in accordance with workers compensation medical fee schedule guidelines.
- (920-002)-In response to a provider inquiry, we have re-analyzed this bill and arrived at the same recommended allowance.

2. This dispute relates to emergency services with radiological and laboratory studies provided in a hospital setting with

reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(a)(3) and (a)(5), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which state that such services are not covered by this guideline and shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate until the issuance of a fee guideline addressing these specific services.

3. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that “reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers’ Compensation Act, §413.011”...
4. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual’s behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include “a copy of all medical bill(s) as originally submitted to the carrier for reconsideration in accordance with §133.304.” This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on June 13, 2006. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not submitted a copy of the original bill. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format, and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(A).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires that the request shall include “a table listing the specific disputed health care and charges in the form, format and manner prescribed by the commission”. Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has indicated that the amount billed for the services in dispute is the total for all services charged on the hospital bill; however the documentation does not support that all of the services in dispute were rendered on the date of service listed on the requestor’s *Table of Disputed Services*. The requestor listed the disputed date of service as 6/18/05 on the *Table*; the total charges on the bill were for date of service 6/17/05 and 6/18/05. Therefore, the requestor has failed to complete the required sections of the request in the form, format, and manner prescribed by the Division sufficient to meet the requirements of 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(C).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a copy of any pertinent medical records”... Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not sent a copy of any pertinent medical records. The Division concludes that the requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282; and applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003 requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including “a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include: (i) a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute, (ii) the requestor’s reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded, (iii) how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues, and (iv) how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not discuss or explain how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues, or how the submitted documentation supports the requestor’s position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that requestor has not provided documentation sufficient to meet the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C).
9. Division Rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §133.1 of this title (relating to Definitions) and §134.1 of this title (relating to Use of the Fee Guidelines)”. The requestor asserts in the position statement that “Understanding that TWCC is wanting to move to a hospital reimbursement of a %-over-Medicare, we have used that methodology in our calculation of fair and reasonable. Medicare would have reimbursed the provider at the rate of 125% over the Medicare Fee Schedule for CPT’s 93307, 93320, 93325, 93005, 93012 and 71260...leaving a balance owed of \$1,955.44.” Review of the documentation finds that the requestor did not discuss or explain how it determined that 125% of the Medicare rate would yield a fair and reasonable reimbursement. Nor did the requestor submit evidence to support the proposed methodology. Nor has the requestor discussed how the proposed methodology would be consistent with the criteria of Labor Code §413.011 or 28 TAC §134.1. Additionally, the requestor did not provide documentation, such as Medicare fee schedules, redacted EOBs, payment policy manual excerpts, or other evidence, to support the Medicare payment calculation. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute.

In addition, the requestor’s position statement asserts that “Also for the ER charge they would have reimbursed 75% of the billed charges...” However, the requestor does not explain how payment of 75% of billed charges would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement for these services in dispute. The requestor did not submit documentation to support the rationale for increased

reimbursement. The requestor did not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would ensure the quality of medical care, achieve effective medical cost control, provide for payment that is not in excess of a fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, consider the increased security of payment, or otherwise satisfy the statutory requirements and Division rules. Additionally, the Division has determined that a reimbursement methodology based upon a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”

Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not discussed, demonstrated or justified that payment in the amount sought by the requestor would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended. The request for additional reimbursement is not supported.

10. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(e)(2)(A), §133.307(e)(2)(C), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C), and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to meet its burden of proof to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code § 413.011(a-d), § 413.031 and § 413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §133.304, §134.401
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION AND/OR ORDER

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

2/8/2010

Authorized Signature

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division Rule 148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code Section 413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code Section 413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.